



Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #: M4-05-1135-01
VISTA MEDICAL CENTER 4301 VISTA RD PASADENA TX 77504-2117	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Carrier's Austin Representative Box #:	Date of Injury:
TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO. Box #: 54	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "... there is no evidence or denials presented by the Carrier that the prices billed were not Vista's usual and customary charges (which the Hospital must bill under Commission rules), that the price markup was not consistent with the geographical or other hospital billing practices, or that the final price was not fair and reasonable.... the Carrier is required to reimburse Vista pursuant to the stop-loss method of reimbursement."

Amount in Dispute: \$32,093.02

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "It is this carrier's position that a) the requester failed to produce any credible evidence that its billing for the disputed procedures is fair and reasonable; b) the requester failed to prove its usual and customary fees for the service in dispute is fair and reasonable are consistent with Section 413.011(b); c) this carrier's payment is consistent with fair and reasonable criteria established in section 413.011(b) of the Texas Labor Code; and d) Medicare fair and reasonable reimbursement for similar or same service is below this carrier's."

Response Submitted by: Texas Mutual Insurance Company, 221 West 6th Street, Suite 300, Austin TX 78701-3403

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
11/11/2003- 11/12/2003	M, T2, F, 66	Outpatient Surgery	\$32,093.02	\$0.00
			Total Due:	\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on October 14, 2004. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on October 19, 2004 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:

- M – No MAR
- T2 – REDUCTION WAS MADE ON OUTPATIENT BILL.
- F – Fee guideline MAR reduction
- 66 – PAYMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE FEE SCHEDULE GUIDELINES FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF MULTIPLE SURGICAL PROCEDURES PERFORMED ON THE SAME DATE.

2. This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(5)(A), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which requires that when "Trauma (ICD-9 codes 800.0-959.50)" diagnosis codes are listed as the primary diagnosis, reimbursement for the entire admission shall be at a fair and reasonable rate. Review of box 67 on the hospital bill finds that the principle diagnosis code is listed as 836.00. The Division therefore determines that this inpatient admission is a trauma admission and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d).
3. The requestor asks for reimbursement under the stop-loss provision of the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* found in Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6). Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, states, in part, that "The diagnosis codes specified in paragraph (5) of this subsection are exempt from the stop-loss methodology and the entire admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate." As stated above, the Division has found that the primary diagnosis is a diagnosis code specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(5); therefore, the disputed services are exempt from the stop-loss methodology and the entire admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
4. This dispute relates to services with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
5. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include "a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)... relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include a copy of the EOB detailing the carrier response to the request for reconsideration. Neither has the requestor submitted convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "a copy of any pertinent medical records." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided copies of all medical records pertinent to the services in dispute. Although the requestor did submit a copy of the operative report, the requestor did not submit a copy of the anesthesia record, post-operative care record, or other pertinent medical records sufficient to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not provide a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's position statement asserts that "... there is no evidence or denials presented by the Carrier that the prices billed were not Vista's usual and customary charges (which the Hospital must bill under Commission rules), that the price markup was not consistent with the geographical or other hospital billing practices, or that the final price was not fair and reasonable."

- The Division has previously found that “hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital’s costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors,” as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, 22 TexReg 6276 (July 4, 1997). It further states that “Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered... and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges...” 22 TexReg 6268-6269. Therefore, the use of a hospital’s “usual and customary” charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The requestor asks to be reimbursed 75% of billed charges, in support of which the requestor states that “Specifically, reimbursement consists of 75% of remaining charges for the entire admission, after a Carrier audits a bill. See Tex. Admin. Code Section 133.401(c). This figure is presumptively considered to be ‘fair and reasonable’ in accordance with the preamble of TWCC Rule 134. See 22 TexReg 6265.”
- As noted above, the stop-loss reimbursement methodology does not apply to these services.
- Review of the medical bill finds that the total charges listed in box 47 are \$33,518.92. The Division notes that the total billed charges are less than the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40,000.00 specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §133.401(c)(6).
- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a percentage of a hospital’s billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the adoption preamble to the Division’s former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

“A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.”

Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital’s billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.

- In support of the requested reimbursement, the requestor submitted redacted explanations of benefits, and selected portions of EOBs, from various sample insurance carriers. However, the requestor did not discuss or explain how the sample EOBs support the requestor’s position that additional payment is due. Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not establish that the sample EOBs are for services that are substantially similar to the services in dispute. The carriers’ reimbursement methodologies are not described on the EOBs. Nor did the requestor explain or discuss the sample carriers’ methodologies or how the payment amount was determined for each sample EOB. The requestor did not discuss whether such payment was typical for such services or for the services in dispute.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not support that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

11. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311
 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1
 Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

_____	Grayson Richardson	5/27/2011
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date
_____	_____	_____
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.